

in there, there is no book to stop the agency from getting out of control. In your amendment you talk about going back to the 1987 delineation manual and sticking to that until we get something better. You define wetlands in your definitions of your amendment as land that supports aquatic vegetation or wetlands-type vegetation. That is your definition of a wetland.

I say to my colleague, now, on your way home tonight, or when you come in in the morning, because it's going to be dark here, go by just 395, make a right, go down about a mile, and you'll see a sign that says the future site of the Fairmount Hotel, and it's an acre or two of land that has toolies, that has sitting water on it, that looks, by every definition, as a wetland, but this is land that's been developed for a long time that we tore down an old building. They're putting up a new one.

I say to my colleagues, I mean you have got to have something more to it than that. You've got to define the difference between the wetlands I saw in Louisiana and this. You've got to define the difference between what the value of these wetlands are to the environment. You don't do that; that's what we're trying to fix.

Mr. Chairman, we are trying to stop the agencies from going out, and running amok, and trying to do this type of thing. That is what has to stop. I say to my colleague, your amendment to this bill doesn't do that, and I understand the importance of wetlands in different parts of the country. I heard the people in North Carolina talk about the importance of wetlands to their area. I heard the people in Louisiana talk about the fishermen, talk about the importance of wetlands to their livelihood. I heard the people in Vancouver talk about the importance of wetlands to their livelihood, but there is a big difference between the wetlands that they talk about and the wetlands that look like this. They are not the same thing.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMBO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOELERT. I would like to read one section, section 818, definitions. The term "wetland" means those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface water or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support and that, under normal circumstances, do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted to life in saturated soil conditions.

Mr. POMBO. OK. Now, does the gentleman understand his definition because I am going to ask the gentleman a question about that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. POMBO was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. POMBO. I say to the gentleman, If you understand your definition of

what is in your amendment, if I had a broken water pipe, and the land was sufficiently saturated so that it would support the kind of vegetation that is in a wetland, would that not fit your definition?

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMBO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. No, it would not, because that was manmade, and it is frequency that the gentleman is ignoring. That was a one-time occurrence.

Mr. POMBO. Reclaiming my time, I have read the gentleman's amendment. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman's definition states that it is land that is saturated enough so that it will sustain aquatic vegetation.

Mr. BOEHLERT. But the gentleman is forgetting the frequency part of the definition. That is important.

Mr. POMBO. Yes, if the land is wet long enough, it will support that kind of vegetation.

In my house in California, across the street they have a cattle trough, and it runs over all the time because it comes out of a spring and it supports aquatic vegetation. It has got toolies down the cattle pasture. It is saturated long enough to fit the gentleman's definition, and it is not a wetland, and that is the kind of stuff we are trying to stop. I say to the gentleman, You don't allow us to do that. You're getting back into the original reason that the Clean Water Act was passed. We wanted to stop polluted rivers. We wanted to stop polluted rivers.

Now, somewhere along the line they decided that we were going to regulate wetlands under the Clean Water Act, and there is a reason to protect wetlands. We all understand that. Any of us that have done our homework understands the reason to protect wetlands, real wetlands. But there is a big difference between differing types of wetlands. I say to the gentleman, What you have in your home State is not the same as what I have in my district.

□ 2030

What Mr. HAYES has in Louisiana is not the same as what is in my district. You are not giving us the ability to differentiate between those. You are throwing it back to the bureaucrats, throwing it back to the regulators and telling them you are going to make the decision. You are avoiding making the tough policy decisions that have to be made. Let us give it to the bureaucrats.

One of the things that has frustrated me the most about serving in this body is that we intentionally draft legislation to be as vague as possible so that we can always blame it on the regulators. We can always blame it on the bureaucrats. It is always their fault. It is never our fault.

Unless we start making changes like this bill has in it, we will never correct these problems. Make the tough decisions.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCINNIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 961) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET TO FILE REPORT ON CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Budget have until midnight tonight to file its report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

MEDICARE AND THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues tell us they want to fix Medicare. But I find it curious that fixing Medicare was never a Republican priority until they needed to pay for a \$345 billion tax break for the wealthy.

Even now the Republicans have failed to put forth a concrete plan that will ensure the long-term solvency of Medicare without compromising health care costs and quality for our Nation's seniors. All the Republicans have put forward is a proposal to cut Medicare by \$285 billion. This plan is all cuts and no reform.

This convenient discovery of a Medicare crisis is nothing but a smoke-screen for the real Republican goal: They want to use Medicare as a piggy bank for their tax giveaway to the wealthiest 1 percent of the taxpayers.

The GOP budget takes away \$1,060 in Medicare benefits from seniors on fixed incomes to pay for a \$20,000 a year windfall to those Americans making over \$350,000. Courageous? Hardly.

And, what of the Republican plan for reform? While the Republicans don't mind being specific about tax giveaways and Medicare cuts, they've